

Austin & Rogers, P.A.

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

WILLIAM FREDERICK AUSTIN
(1930-2016)

TIMOTHY F. ROGERS
RAYMON E. LARK, JR.
RICHARD L. WHITT
EDWARD L. EUBANKS
W. MICHAEL DUNCAN*

COLUMBIA OFFICE
CONGAREE BUILDING
508 HAMPTON STREET, SUITE 203
POST OFFICE BOX 11716 (29211)
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 256-4000
FACSIMILE: (803) 252-3679
WWW.AUSTINROGERSPA.COM

OF COUNSEL:
JEFFERSON D. GRIFFITH, III

* ALSO ADMITTED IN N.C.

March 27, 2019

VIA, ELECTRONIC FILING

The Honorable Jocelyn Boyd
Chief Clerk and Administrator
The Public Service Commission of South Carolina
101 Executive Center Drive
Columbia, South Carolina 29210

Re: • **Docket 2018-202-E**
 • **SCSBA's Motion**

Ms. Boyd:

As you know, I sent correspondence yesterday relevant to the above-referenced Docket, concerning the South Carolina Solar Business Alliance, Inc.'s, ("SCSBA") pending Motion for 1). Leave to File Responsive Comments; 2). Delay a Final Report; and 3). Open a New Docket.

After my correspondence yesterday, counsel for Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC and Duke Energy Progress, LLC (collectively, "Companies"), e-filed a Joint Initial Response to the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff's ("ORS") Recommendations and SCSBA's Motion.

I write to you because the Companies' Joint Response yesterday, is in agreement with the three components of relief sought in SCSBA's pending Motion. Namely:

1). "Leave to File Responsive Comments", (from SCSBA's Motion)

"In response to ORS Recommendation 4, the Companies are not opposed to allowing other parties an opportunity to provide comments to the Commission on the Companies' Queue Report. Similarly, the SCSBA Motion seeks leave to file responsive comments to the Companies' Queue Report, and the Companies are not opposed to this requested relief." (page 6 of Companies' Response).

2). “Open a New Docket”, (from SCSBA’s Motion)

“In response to ORS Recommendation 1, the Companies do not oppose ORS’s recommendation to open a docket to specifically examine the technical issues contributing to the Companies’ interconnection queue challenges. The SCSBA Motion makes a similar request, which the Companies do not oppose.” (page 3 of Companies’ Response).

3). “Delay a Final Report”, (from SCSBA’s Motion)

The Companies’ agreement with SCSBA’s request “1” and “2” above, provides the relief sought by SCSBA in this provision.

Because the Companies’ e-filing yesterday provides agreement with the three prongs of SCSBA’s pending Motion, we request that you so advise the Commission, so that SCSBA’s pending Motion may be considered and approved. Because the Companies are in agreement with the above described portions of SCSBA’s Motion, this may be a matter that can be handled by a Directive Order from a Standing Hearing Officer and if that is appropriate, I hereby request the same. This correspondence is,

Respectfully Submitted,
AUSTIN & ROGERS, P.A.

/s/Richard L. Whitt,
Richard L. Whitt,
As counsel for the South Carolina Solar Business
Alliance, Inc., and Ecoplexus, Inc.

RLW/cas
cc: All Parties of Record, (via, electronic mail)